IV. REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 21, 23, 28-30, 34 and 35 have been amended. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 9, 13, 16-19, 22-26 and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Grossman *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,175), hereafter "Grossman." Claims 6-8, 10-12, 14-15, 20-21, 27-29 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Grossman in view of Official Notice. These rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons stated below.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5, 9, 13, 16-19, 22-26 and 30-33 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection over Grossman, Applicant asserts that Grossman does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 9, 16, 23, 30 and 35, Applicant submits that Grossman fails to teach a control file having entries of computer system identifiers. The invention in Grossman allows a workstation to boot from a network having a plurality of servers, which may have differing operating systems. Abstract. The instructions for booting the Grossman workstation are contained on a single boot ROM. Col. 3, lines 65-67. To determine what types of servers are

present on the network, Grossman sends a FIND command out to the network. Col. 4, lines 21-22. Grossman then examines the FOUND frames returned by the servers for characteristic features that identify what types of servers are present. Col. 4, lines 30-40. However, the identifiers used by Grossman are simply characteristic features, not a control file having entries of computer system identifiers. Furthermore, the characteristic features in Grossman are used to identify servers, not the workstation. Nowhere does Grossman teach a control file having entries of computer system identifiers." In contrast, the present invention includes "...a control file having entries of computer system identifiers." Claim 1. As such, the control file as included in the claimed invention is not simply characteristic features as in Grossman, but rather has entries of computer system identifiers. Furthermore, the control file as included in the claimed invention is not simply used for the limited purpose of identifying servers as are the characteristic features in Grossman, but instead have entries of computer system identifiers. Thus, the control file as included in the present invention is not equivalent to the characteristic features of Grossman. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claims 1, 16, 23 and 30, Applicant respectfully submits that Grossman also fails to teach a software platform to be installed on the designated computer system. As stated above, Grossman boots a workstation from one of a number of servers on a network. Abstract. However, Grossman never teaches that a software platform is to be installed on the workstation. The present invention, in contrast, includes "...a software platform to be installed on the designated computer system." Claim 1. As such, the designated computer system included in the claimed invention does not simply boot from a server, but rather a software platform is to be installed on the designated computer. For the above reasons, the

09/934,896   Page 13 of 17

booting from a server of Grossman is not equivalent to the software platform to be installed on the designated computer system as included in the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With further respect to independent claim 9 and with respect to dependent claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that Grossman also fails to teach installing a selected software platform onto a computer system having the entered computer system identifiers. As stated above, Grossman boots a workstation from one of a number of servers on a network. Abstract. Grossman determines which server to boot from by examining characteristic features of the servers' FOUND frames. Col. 4, lines 30-40. However, Grossman never teaches that a software platform is installed on the workstation or that the workstation has entered computer identifiers. The present invention, in contrast, includes "...installing the selected software platform onto a computer system having the entered computer identifiers." Claim 9. As such, the selected software platform as included in the claimed invention is not simply used to boot a workstation from a server as in Grossman, but is instead installed onto a computer system. Furthermore, the software platform in as included in the claimed invention is installed on the computer system that has the entered computer identifiers, not booted from a server having a FOUND frame with characteristic features as in Grossman. For the above reasons, the booting from a server of Grossman is not equivalent to installing the selected software platform onto a computer system having the entered computer system identifiers as included in the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore,

09/934,896   Page 14 of 17

Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 6-8, 10-12, 14-15, 20-21, 27-29 and 34-35 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Grossman in view of Official Notice, Applicant submits that the Office's factual assertion is not properly based upon common knowledge. For example, Applicant asserts that providing a control file having entries of computer system identifiers wherein the entries in the control file further comprise support data and wherein the support data comprises licensing data and technical data is not obvious to one skilled in the art as asserted by the Office. Applicant further asserts that providing a control file having entries of computer system identifiers wherein the entries in the control file further comprise support data and further comprising the step of displaying the support data from the identified entry is also not obvious to one skilled in the art as asserted by the Office. Applicant still further asserts that providing a control file having entries of computer system identifiers wherein the entries in the control file further comprise support data and further comprising the step of displaying the support data from the identified entry and designating a computer system and a software platform using an interface wherein the designated software platform is installed onto the computer system based upon the support data is also not obvious to one skilled in the art as asserted by the Office. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office support the finding with references that show these features.

09/934,896   Page 15 of 17

Applicant further submits that the combined features of the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 14, 29 and 35, Applicants hereby incorporate the arguments enumerated above with respect to claims 1, 9, 16, 23 and 30. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Office withdraw its rejections.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicant will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserves the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

V. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2004

Ronald A. D'Alessandro
Reg. No.: 42,456

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
Three E-Comm Square
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)